

Serial No. 09/920,827

Docket No. HI-0038

Amdt. dated April 10, 2008

Reply to Office Action of December 11, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 32, 34-36, 39-40, and 42-45 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 43-45 are added. Claim 8-25 are canceled. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative at the February 27, 2008 personal interview. The points discussed are incorporate herein.

The Office Action rejected claims 32, 34-36, 39, 40, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crisp, U.S. Patent No. 7,209,772 in view of Slipy et al. (hereinafter "Slipy"), U.S. Patent No. 5,848,152. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed features of the present application provide a mobile telephone for which it is possible to change the manner of covering and exposing a button portion thereof so that a user may take advantage of characteristics of respective types of mobile telephones. A mobile telephone according to an exemplary embodiment is shown, for example, in Figure 4 of the present application and includes a telephone body 20 provided with a button portion 22, and interchangeable button covers which may be detachably coupled to the telephone body 20. The interchangeable button covers are structures for protecting and/or exposing the button portion 22 of the telephone body 20, may be attached to and removed from the mobile telephone, and include a bar type cover, a flip type cover, and a sliding lid type cover. The interchangeable

button covers may include a bar unit 30, as shown in Figure 5A, for providing the bar-type cover for a mobile telephone, a flip unit 40, as shown in Figure 5B, for providing the flip-type cover for mobile telephone, or a sliding unit 50, as shown in Figure 5C, for providing the sliding lid-type cover for a mobile telephone. According to embodiments, a user may easily alter the manner of protecting and exposing the button portion of a mobile telephone by mounting one of the units 30, 40, 50 on the telephone body 20 according to the user's preference.

Independent claim 32 recites, *inter alia*, wherein the plurality of interchangeable button covers each further comprise a pair of projections positioned at the upper ends of the frames of the interchangeable button covers to mate with corresponding fixing recesses disposed at upper ends of the plurality of grooves. Independent claim 39 recites, *inter alia*, wherein the pair of grooves each comprises a fixing recess configured to mate with projections provided at the upper ends of the frames of the interchangeable button covers, wherein the fixing recesses are disposed at upper ends of the plurality of grooves. Crisp and Slipy, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest such features, or the respective claimed combinations of independent claim 32 and 39.

That is, the Examiner acknowledges that "Crisp does not disclose a plurality of interchangeable button covers, each having a frame configured to mate with the plurality of grooves, wherein the pair of interchangeable button covers include[s] a bar type button cover, a flip type button cover, and a slide type button cover, and wherein the button covers are just for

covering the button portion.” The Examiner then asserts that “Slipy...discloses wherein the button the plurality of interchangeable button covers (e.g., faceplates) include a bar type cover (see Fig. 1 and face plate 104) and a flip type button cover (see Fig. 10 and key pad cover 418) (therefore, it would have been obvious to include a slide type button cover, as shown in the Crisp reference), and wherein the button covers are just for covering the button portion (see Fig. 10 and key plate cover 418).” The Examiner then concludes that “it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features as part of the mobile telephone, as a way of providing a distinctive user interface appearance for the telephone, thereby giving the telephone one distinctive appearance, of a plurality of distinctive telephone appearance, by allowing the user to change the faceplate/cover and choose other distinctive appearance at a later time.”

However, the Examiner corresponds the recesses 26 shown in Fig. 9 of Crisp with the claimed projections. Crisp discloses a plurality of recesses 26 configured to mate with a plurality of a detents 23, as shown in Figs 9 and 10. However, in the Crisp device, the detents 23 are depressed below a surface of a bottom of the groove 20 for disengagement from the recesses 26 to allow the sleeve portion 3 to continue to slide in a chosen direction. Thus, the Crisp disclosed recesses 26 and detents 23 are only for a sleeve type cover. Further, the recesses 26 are provided on the sleeve portion 3, which corresponds to the claimed button covers, while the detents 23 are provided at a lower end of the main body. See Fig. 10 of Crisp. Thus, Crisp does not

Serial No. 09/920,827

Docket No. HI-0038

Amdt. dated April 10, 2008

Reply to Office Action of December 11, 2007

disclose or suggest a plurality of interchangeable button covers each comprising a pair of projections positioned at upper ends of the frame and configure to mate with corresponding fixing recesses disposed at upper ends of the plurality of grooves.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 32 and 39 over Crisp and Slipy should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 34-36, 40, and 42 are allowable over Crisp and Slipy at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 32 and 39, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Added dependent claims 43-45 are allowable over Crisp and Slipy in view of their dependency on independent claim 32, as well as for their added features.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **09/920,827**

Docket No. **HI-0038**

Amtdt. dated April 10, 2008

Reply to Office Action of December 11, 2007

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Druzbiek
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

(703) 766-3777 CLD:tlg

Date: April 10, 2008

\\Fk4\Documents\2019\2019-137\154713.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610